

TRANSCRIPT

November 24, 2009

MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL

PRESENT

Councilmember Phil Andrews, President

Councilmember Roger Berliner
Councilmember Valerie Ervin
Councilmember Michael Knapp
Councilmember Nancy Navarro

Councilmember Marc Elrich
Councilmember Nancy Floreen
Councilmember George Leventhal
Councilmember Duchy Trachtenberg



COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Good morning, everybody, and welcome to a session of the County Council. We are going to begin with a moment of silence, so please stand for that. I'm just going to mention at the beginning of it that our thoughts are with the family and friends of Scott Doyle, a career firefighter who passed away last week after suffering a traumatic brain injury in the spring, and also with firefighter Sean Carroll, who, in the course of responding to a house fire and working to rescue people, had burns to his hands. So we wish him a speedy recovery, and our thoughts are very much with him and with the family and friends of the late Scott Dovle. So please join me in a moment of silence. Thank you, We're going to now have a presentation that is a proclamation in recognition of Ana Lopez, recipient of the Meyer Foundation Exponent Award, by Councilmember Floreen.

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

Thank you, and if I could ask Councilmember Navarro, Councilmember Trachtenberg, and Councilmember Ervin to join me. Miss Lopez, we're so proud of you. Ana is the executive director of Community Bridges in Silver Spring. She has a Master's degree in Social Work, was a member of the 2007 class of Leadership Montgomery, and has years of experience working with Latino immigrant families and youth. And today, we're proud and grateful that Ana has chosen to share her significant talents and experiences with Montgomery County. Ana is the recipient of a \$100,000 grant from the Meyer Foundation. Way to go, Ana. Of course, we already knew about the great work that Ana and Community Bridges do for girls who are vulnerable to gang involvement, teen pregnancy, and academic failure, and now we're really gratified that the Meyer Foundation has recognized her, too. The Exponent Award, which is what Ana is receiving, is incredibly prestigious, and we think that the foundation made a terrific choice this year. And, Ana, we have a proclamation to read, but I'd like to let my colleagues say a few words in praise of you.

COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

First of all, we can't be more proud of you, Ana, than we are today. But Ana has been around Montgomery County for a while, working with young girls, and we had recently heard a report about women in poverty, and it's so important that the work you're doing with young girls and young women to really hold them up and give them all the background and all the support and all the love that you provide for all these girls in Silver Spring and other places around the County. We're really, really proud, and of course the Meyer Foundation found out about you, and you are being recognized for your great work. So congratulations.

ANA LOPEZ:

39 Thank you.

COUNCILMEMBER NAVARRO:



1 Well, Ana, obviously, this is truly, truly an honor to recognize you. I think that you have not only given of yourself in the work that you do, but you are an amazing role model for our 2 3 girls--our Latino girls, especially. It's so important for them to see people like you, like your staff, that steps up every single day in the name of excellence to give them and empower 4 them to go forward. So I'm extremely proud of you and all the work that you have done. 5 You've taken this organization from its infancy, really, and developed it into an amazing 6 presence in the Long Branch area and beyond, and so congratulations, and 7 congratulations on your engagement, and please, you know, continue--continue doing 8 what you're doing because we really need you to continue to do that. So congratulations. 9

10 11

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

12 Duchy.

13 14

COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

Well, I want to congratulate you, Ana, on your accomplishments, and I also want to 15 16 recognize the fact that you're an extraordinary role model for young women in this County. And, you know, as someone who's worked on women's issues for a number of years--for 17 18 a good 30 years--I know how important it is that people like you emerge in communities -not only to provide leadership and inspiration, but really to do the heavy lifting, and I know 19 that's what your life has been about in this community. So I want to recognize that, and I 20 want to tell you that I support you, clearly, and I know my colleagues do, as well, as you 21 continue your heavy lifting for women here in this County, but also reach for the stars, 22 23 because I have a feeling that Ana Lopez is--her name will be known not just in Montgomery County, but in other places, as well.

24 25 26

27

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

Absolutely. Well, thank you, to my colleagues, and, Duchy, you want to start us off reading this proclamation?

28 29 30

31

32

COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

Mm-hmm. "Whereas, the Meyer Foundation Exponent Award celebrates visionary nonprofit leaders and awards a \$100,000 grant to the recipient's organization to be used for leadership development; and whereas..." Nancy?

33 34 35

COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

36 I don't have any glasses on.

37 38

COUNCILMEMBER NAVARRO:

I'll take mine off and give them to you.

39 40

41 COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

42 They're an accessory.

3



> 4 5

> 8

COUNCILMEMBER NAVARRO:

"And whereas, the Exponent Award is designed to support and sustain the most capable nonprofit leaders in the Greater Washington region..."

6

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

7 And...

9

COUNCILMEMBER NAVARRO:

10 And...

11 12 13

14

15

COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

"And whereas, Community Bridges works with girls ages 8-15 from low-income, predominantly immigrant families in Silver Spring and Takoma Park, helping them gain the skills and values necessary for their personal well-being, academic success, and development as change agents in the community, and..."

20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28 29

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

"Whereas, this year, Ana Lopez, executive director of Community Bridges, was selected as one of 5 recipients of this prestigious award; and whereas, under Miss Lopez's leadership, Community Bridges' operating budget has nearly doubled, the number of program sites has expanded from 5 to 15 schools, and the number of girls served has increased to more than 200; and whereas, last year, Community Bridges became one of only 75 nonprofits in Maryland to be certified under the Maryland Association of Nonprofit Organizations Standards for Excellence Program; now, therefore, be it resolved that the County Council of Montgomery County hereby honors Ana Lopez for her undying commitment to Montgomery County girls, their families, and their communities." Dated this 24th day of November in the year 2009 and signed by our Council President, Phil Andrews. We are so proud of you, Ana. And would you like to share a few words with us? Yeah. I'll hold on to this.

30 31

ANA LOPEZ:

32 33 Well, first I just want to say thank you so much to all of you because I have not done this by myself. All of you on the County Council have been incredible supporters over these 34 35 last 4 years, since I've been executive director of Community Bridges, and have really helped me take this organization to the next level. So to all the incredible women behind 36 me and to the men--37

38 39

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

Good politician.

40 41 42

ANA LOPEZ:



- Ha ha ha! I just want to reiterate just the importance of this work, you know? If a girl 1
- becomes pregnant when she's a teenager, that's a sign of immediate poverty. If a girl--a 2
- teenage girl from a low-income family drops out of school, it's a sign of immediate poverty. 3
- And so, the work that we are doing not only is preventing these issues from happening 4
- with the over 250 girls we serve weekly, it's really preventing a burden, an economic 5
- burden, on our County down the road. And so I cannot thank all of you, and just especially 6
- during these difficult times, I know how hard it is to support organizations like ours, but 7 8
 - every little bit has helped us, and so thank you.

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

Well, thank you, Ana. Go spend that money wisely. And with that, we have the ceremonial picture. Come on up. Duchy, you want to get close to the...

12 13 14

15

16

17

11

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Congratulations, Miss Lopez. And thanks to the female members of the Council for doing the honors. All right. All of us--all of us very much recognize the excellent work that's done by Community Bridges and congratulate them on the recognition. We're now going to go on to General Business, A-- announcement of the agenda and calendar changes. Miss Lauer.

18 19 20

LINDA LAUER:

21 Good morning. As you already know, the proposed closed session this morning had been-22 23 -has already been canceled, but in the Consent Calendar, agenda Item 2G has been 24 deferred, and that's the resolution regarding the creation of a Health Impact Assessment 25 working group. We did receive two petitions this week, both relating to the disclaimer for Pregnancy Resource Center--one petition supported, and one petition opposed. Thank 26 27 you.

28 29

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

30 Thank you. OK. Our next item is action on approval of the minutes of November 10 and 31 12, 2009. Is there a motion?

32 33

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

So moved. 34

35 36

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

37 Moved by Council Vice President Berliner. Seconded by...

38 39

COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

40 Second.

41 42

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:



Councilmember Leventhal. Any comments? Seeing none, all those in favor of the minutes of November 10 and 12, for approval, please raise your hand. And that's unanimous, 9-0. We'll now move on to the Consent Calendar. Moved by Councilmember Knapp.

3 4 5

1

2

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

6 Second.

78

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28 29

30

31

32 33

34 35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Seconded by Council Vice President Berliner, I'm going to make a comment on Public Safety Committee report -- Item E, the Public Safety Committee report and recommendation on the Office of Legislative Oversight report 2010-3, Evaluation of Montgomery County's Safe Speed Program. I want to acknowledge, as has always been the case, the great work done by our Office of Legislative Oversight in analyzing policy issues, and the Public Safety Committee made a number of recommendations as a result of the findings of the report. Let me first emphasize that the key finding in the report, in my view, is the reduction in collisions that has occurred on streets with speed cameras compared to the year before, when there were no speed cameras. Speed cameras have resulted in a substantial reduction in collisions--they're down 28% --and collisions that involved an injury or fatality were down 39% on those streets. I think that is very clear evidence that speed cameras are working to make our streets safer and that they have been an important public safety tool for the County to address the very serious problem of speeding in residential neighborhoods and near school zones. So I want to also commend the Montgomery County police department for implementing the program in a--in a very effective and thoughtful way, and we've heard several times from representatives of the police department about how they went about this. It was very deliberate, well planned, and responsive to the community. So my hat's off to all of the Montgomery County police officers who have been involved in implementing the speed camera program that is currently headed by Captain Damskey. The recommendations are that the Public Safety Committee recommends the Council employ its oversight role to ensure continued public outreach and involvement in the speed camera program, that the Public Safety Committee recommends the Council require that information on the Safe Speed Program expenditures, revenues, and the use of net revenues appear on the Safe Speed web site and in future annual budget documents, that the Council ask the Executive to negotiate Memoranda of Understanding that require that either municipalities process their own speed camera fines, fees, and penalties, or the County recovers the full cost for doing so. Municipalities have indicated that they do plan to process their own, and that's good news. The Public Safety Committee also is asking the Executive branch to return in January to discuss operational and public outreach issues resulting from the new state restrictions on school zone speed camera operating hours. And the Public Safety Committee has asked the Executive branch to return in January to present information about how the restricted hours of operation in school zones have affected vehicle speeds and the rate of collisions. In addition, the Public Safety Committee has asked the Executive branch to return in

6



January to present revised FY10 Safe Speed revenue projections and has directed OLO to prepare a memorandum report that summarizes the major findings of the report for submission to the General Assembly, and a draft copy of the memorandum report appears on circles 9-13. As my colleagues will recall, the County Council was required under the law adopted by the General Assembly to authorize speed cameras in Montgomery County--we were the first County to be authorized to have them--to report back by the end of this year on the results of the program, so that's what we are going to do. And that is a summary of the Public Safety Committee report and recommendations that is included in the Consent Calendar, but I wanted to draw attention to it because I think the Safe Speed Program has achieved a very important public purpose, and that's due to the very effective work of our police department and to our residents responding to the presence of cameras and slowing down and driving safer, and the proof is in the reduction of collisions. So that's my comment on that, and I'll turn to Councilmember Trachtenberg, then Council Vice President Berliner and Councilmember Knapp.

14 15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28 29

30

31

32 33

34 35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

Thank you, President Andrews. I actually wanted to pull out item number D, which is the end-year report to the full Council from the Audit Committee. I think it's important to acknowledge the work of the committee and all 5 of my colleagues. We met 5 times during this calendar year. In the month of March, we talked with the inspector general about the potential operation of the committee, as well as with the chief administrative officer. We also talked with Mr. Dagley about the structure of his office, and we went over some of the risk-assessment issues specific to County government finances. In April, we talked about the external audits of the County government's financial statements, and were joined by our audit firm, Clifton Gunderson, and also Rager, Lehman & Houck. In September of this year, we had a conversation that was specific to contract management. Again, we were joined by the chief administrative officer and the director of the Department of Health and Human Services, and specifically the work was focused on contract administration and fiscal monitoring-a very important conversation. In November of this year, we talked again to the director of Department of Health and Human Services about a new work group that had been formed around contract managing-- monitoring, rather. We also talked with the inspector general again about his 4-year work plan. And the last item that was addressed, back in early November, was a committee discussion of Bill 40-09, Personnel - Audits - Trust Fund, and that bill is actually before you today for consideration. We discussed it briefly this morning once again, making sure that it reflected agreement amongst all parties. Specifically, there had been some interaction between our staff and different unions to make sure that we had agreement on whatever process would be utilized for that purpose. So, again, that's a summary of what we talked about--a lot of work, and I imagine that we'll have our hands full the next calendar year, since-- not only because we're in a difficult budget situation, but clearly we recognize that there are continued improvements that will be made around a lot of government functions, including the oversight of contracts.

7



COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you, Councilmember Trachtenberg. The--as you noted, the MFP Committee has met as the Audit Committee 5 times this year now and took up the bill this morning on the audits and recommended approval. That's actually on the agenda for next Tuesday at this point.

COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

9 Oh. OK.

9 C

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you, though, for the report. Council Vice President Berliner.

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

Briefly, colleagues, Item F is action that we will take to accept the County Executive's request that we extend until April the timeframe in which we will receive from the Executive branch the regulations implementing the Home Energy Loan Program, a program that this Council, I know, feels strongly about, as does the County Executive. The legislation that we passed had called upon the County Executive to have regulations to us by October 15, with the hope that we would be able to implement this program this winter heating season. That's not going to happen. It is a very complicated program, and getting the dollars lined up--quite frankly, we haven't gotten the dollars from the Department of Energy yet that we fully expect to get, but we haven't gotten them today. So it is something that we still need to work our way through. We're having good conversations with the Maryland Clean Energy Center, who wants to partner with us with respect to this, but all of these conversations, as well as the details of this program, require a little more time than had been anticipated. So now they have asked for April 15, and if we're not going to have it by this winter heating season, then it seems appropriate to give them sufficient time to get this program right, because we do want to get it right. Thank you.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you, Council Vice President Berliner. And Councilmember Knapp.

COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to speak on Item C in the Consent Calendar--the resolution regarding Montgomery County Public Schools' state funding request for school construction. We submit a letter each year-- the Council President and County Executive-with our request. This year, we are requesting-- or we're eligible for approximately \$139 million in state aid for school construction funding. As has typically been our practice, we expect to get much less than what we're eligible for, and so we usually put about \$40 million in as a placeholder, in hopes that we get near that number. So--again, so we're eligible for 139. We're going to put in 40 as the placeholder, and we hope we get to the



40. In the course of conversation, though, yesterday was even more interesting because it is likely that this year Montgomery County as a school system, with the commitment to education that we've made, will spend more money in capital school construction costs than the state of Maryland will spend for the entire state. Again, Montgomery County, as one jurisdiction, will spend more money for school construction than the state of Maryland will spend for the entire state. I just think it's important for us to understand that. It's an important message for us to continue to put out there. There are those who will say, "See? That's just Montgomery County being flush again." The reality is we've made a commitment to funding education, we've made a commitment to funding the facilities for our students to learn in, and at some point we're hopeful that we can get our state colleagues to join us in that level of commitment. But I think it's important for us to understand those numbers as we go into a challenging year. I think we all recognize that, but in spite of that, we're still going to make sure that we have made--fulfilled our commitment to our students and to our economy to make sure our educational system is as strong as it can possibly be. So I just wanted to put those numbers out there because I think it's important for us to keep that in mind as we proceed forward.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you, Councilmember Knapp. Councilmember Ervin.

COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

To follow up on that point, in the discussion yesterday in the Ed Committee, we also talked about the circular argument that goes on in the state every year, and that is, "Well, there goes Montgomery County again, spending--outspending what most other jurisdictions in the rest of the state do." So I just think that--I understand Councilmember Knapp's point of view on this, but I also want to say that if Montgomery County continues to forward-fund these projects and then go back to the state afterwards to ask for reimbursement, we will continue down this road of always playing the game that somehow we're going to get what we believe is our--what is supposed to come to us. And so we're in the tight budget year that we're in. We can continue to go down this road and forward-fund all these projects and then have the County on the hook for them, or we can maybe reevaluate our strategy in terms of how we deal with the--with the rest of the state on how we fund our projects. So I just wanted to circle that back around. That's from my point of view.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you, Councilmember Ervin, our chair of the Education Committee. All right. There are no more comments on the Consent Calendar, so we're ready to vote on the Consent Calendar. All those in favor, please raise your hand. That is unanimous, 9-0. The Consent Calendar is approved. Our next item is a very important item, and it is action on implementation of recommendations regarding the Office of Legislative Oversight report 2008-9, Hiring Persons with Disabilities:

ç



A Review of County Government Practices. The Management and Fiscal Policy 1 Committee has recommendations regarding the issues, and I will turn to the chair of the 2 Management and Fiscal Policy Committee, Councilmember Trachtenberg, for the 3 committee's report, and I'm going to ask the chairman -- Chair Trachtenberg, I'm going to 4 ask the chair of the disabilities commission -- Montgomery County Commission on People 5 6

with Disabilities--to join us at the front. If the vice chair is present as well--Cindy

Buddington, are you vice chair? No? OK. All right. You used to be chair, right? Come on

8 9 10

7

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

She's Vice Chair Emeritus.

11 12 13

14

15

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Come on up. You're a former chair, a former chair. Come on up. And I will now turn to Councilmember Trachtenberg for the recommendations of the committee on this very important item.

16 17 18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

29 30

31

32 33

34 35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

Thank you, President Andrews. And as I open my remarks--a brief summary of the recommendations provided by the committee--I want to also acknowledge Mark and Cindy for their commitment and their hard work over the years on this important issue, making sure that those that have disabilities have opportunities for employment here in Montgomery County. And additionally, I want to recognize the effort by both Leslie Rubin on our staff, who has joined us, but also the hard work of the Office of the County Attorney, the Office of Human Resources, the Department of Health and Human Services over the years on this, as well. Yesterday, we were joined by Mr. Adler, who I know is in the audience today, from OHR, Mr. Lattner from the Office of the County Attorney, as well as Dr. Kenney from the Aging and Disability Services Program over at HHS. The conversation within MFP on the excellent OLO report that was released last year has been ongoing. I believe we've had two or 3 worksessions over the course of the last 9 months, and yesterday the committee made two recommendations, one specific to the issue of empowering a special hiring authority. The recommendation of the committee was to refer this Charter amendment issue to the Charter Review Commission. One thing we talked about we didn't define in our recommendation was the possibility of actually setting a date for a decision by the commission. We realized that unless there is some recommendation forthcoming from the commission by July, August, there wouldn't be an opportunity to add something to the ballot next November, so I would suggest to colleagues that that might be something we want to talk about this morning on the dais. But the recommendation of the committee was to refer to the commission for consideration-- that we have support for the special hiring authority, and we would like to have some input from the commission. The other recommendation from the committee was to go forward with the County law establishing a hiring preference here in



Montgomery County. We think that that is an important step, an important first step, and we would--we would ask the full body to consider that this morning. I don't know if either of my colleagues want to add to my commentary. I would ask, though, that Dr. Maxin provide some comments at this time, and either--and maybe Cindy, as well. Mark's comments yesterday were both eloquent and persuasive, and I'd like to give you the opportunity this morning, briefly, to make similar remarks.

6 7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28 29

30

31

32 33

34 35

36

37

38 39

40 41

42

1

2

4

5

MARK MAXIN:

Thank you, Duchy, and thank you, everybody, Today is a very, very special day, It reflects that this Council has a vision and a willingness to try to promote the rights of individuals with disabilities. I'd also like to thank the County Attorney because his legal analysis on many of these issues are something that many other counties and other state governments can't figure out, and he did a great job. I'd also like to thank Joe Adler for his vision and his commitment, as well as Jay Kenney for all of his efforts. I'd like to start by telling you what I think it means what you're about to vote on. First of all, we need these initiatives--this hiring preference, this direct hire provision--because of a number of reasons. Number one is that the poverty rate of people with disabilities in Montgomery County is about 43%, and probably much higher. So the figures are guite outrageous. Number two, the participation rate, as far as the actual number of people who are in the government, both the federal government as well as in the County, is extremely--is extremely low. 3, the unemployment rate is very, very high for individuals with disabilities, as well. But there's something else that is underlying all these things, and they were captured by a Supreme Court case called Arline, which I'm sure the County Attorney knows. It stands for the proposition that the accumulated myths and fears associated with a medical condition are sometimes greater than the actual limitations of the medical condition itself. And for just a minute, I'd like you to look at my esteemed colleague Cindy, and some people would look at Cindy and see her chair. I also look at her and see the steel, but the steel I see is of her will and of her wisdom and of her leadership. I follow in her footsteps. And she has been a great inspiration to me and many of the people on the Council-- excuse me, on the commission, And the Council, too, Thank you, And I think that really what is before us right now is to understand that people, when they see somebody, might see the chair; they don't understand that the person who is blind can have vision, that the person who is deaf can listen, that the person who is speechless can have a voice. You know, the individual with the disability, like Cindy-- she has to address not only the stair, but the stare. And we need to be conscious of the inherent discrimination that these individuals face on a daily basis. Today is nothing but a brief step, but an important one. What you are doing today is showing leadership, not only for this County, not only for this state, but honestly, for this nation. Let me explain a little bit about what you're about to accomplish. Direct hire--what's that all about? Well, as somebody who uses direct hire in the federal government, it's a tremendous benefit because most people have to apply for a job, and then they have to go write up their application, and then they have to go through the interviews, and then they have to go,

1



you know, through this whole process, and ultimately compete against a number of people. The direct hire provision allows somebody who is disabled --who, by the way, has to be able to do the job--let's make that clear--to get that job and to basically just walk into somebody's office, and if they have a position they're qualified for, certified by the, you know, Human Resources office as, to be able to get that job if they have a significant disability and certified through, you know, DORS. They don't have to go through that whole merit staffing process. That's a benefit not only for the employee, but for the manager. The manager, sometimes it can take forever to select someone through the merit staffing process. You could probably have hearings on this. Today, what it means is that somebody can--can--a manager can hire somebody more quickly. So that's the benefit for the manager, as well. With regard to disability preference, it seems to me that if-given the data that I have provided you today, that if somebody can make it into the highly qualified list and is extraordinary--given the lack of hiring in this area-- we should give them a preference. So what you're about to do today is critically important, and on behalf of the chairman, I just want to say--and my fellow commissioners--I just want to say that we wholly endorse Option 4, and I hope you vote for both of these. Thank you.

COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

I thank you for those remarks, Mark, and I wondered, Cindy, did you want to add anything or not?

CINDY BUDDINGTON:

No. I think what he said is great.

COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

OK. We've said it all. So those are the recommendations of the committee. Yesterday's conversation within MFP also briefly was focused on the issue around state reimbursements and enhancing, in good times, our intern opportunities here within County government, and we'd like to continue to work on both those opportunities for some advocacy and for some reform, as well. But I'm very proud of the recommendations that have been provided from MFP, and I would encourage my colleagues to support the committee recommendation at this time.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you, Chair Trachtenberg. As you noted, there are really two recommendations that the committee is bringing to the Council. One is regarding a--the process for a potential Charter amendment that would establish a special hiring authority-- similar, likely, to the federal government Schedule A, that was described by--very eloquently by the chair of the commission. And the other is a hiring preference for people with disabilities who qualify for the highest category for which candidates are being considered for the position. I had the pleasure of attending the MFP Committee meeting yesterday for part of the discussion, and I think it's a reasonable suggestion to send the idea of a Charter Commission



amendment to the Charter Commission for its review and recommendation. I would suggest that we should give a deadline of June 30 or July 1 in order to assure that the Council would have time to take action after the recommendation in order to put it on the ballot for this coming--for next November. So--and there seemed to be agreement at the committee session about that approach, so that's a comment there. And--

6 7

COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

Did you want to make a motion?

8 9 10

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

All right. I'll make a motion to make that part of--officially part-- there was informal agreement, I think.

12 13 14

11

COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

15 Right.

16 17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28 29

30

31

32 33

34 35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

OK. So we would establish a deadline of July 1 for the Charter Review Commission to report back on its recommendations regarding a Charter amendment to establish a special hiring authority for people with disabilities-- July 1 of next year. And that would give the Council time to take it up before our deadline for putting a measure on the ballot, and so--and the Council has the option, always, to put measures on the ballot, but we do value the work of the Charter Review Commission, and I think it's very appropriate to ask them to give us their thoughts on this, and I think 7 months should be plenty of time to give them to do that. And so that--I'm pleased that the Council supports that. And so that is the first--and I sense support for that recommendation. Doesn't seem like there are any comments on that particular part of it. And then the second recommendation was to establish a--in effect, to get the process going on instituting, developing a hiring preference for people with disabilities who qualify for the position at the, you know, the highest rating that is for the position that candidates are being considered for. And I'll see if there are any comments on that, but I agree very much with the comments made by the chair of the commission about how important it is for the County to do what it can and to take all feasible steps to increase the opportunities for people with disabilities to work for our County and serve the people in Montgomery County. The underemployment and unemployment rate among people with disabilities is generally considered to be over 70%. It's a staggering waste of human talent, and our Commission on People with Disabilities has highlighted the need for the County to strengthen its policies in this area. The Council has discussed this issue in--a lot of good attention to it in the past few months and over the past year, and our Office of Legislative Oversight did a very thorough analysis of--of the challenges that people with disabilities face in employment and what the County can do to assist and become a best-practice employer with regard to hiring people with disabilities. And so I'm very, very pleased to see the recommendations from the

13



Management and Fiscal Policy Committee, and I thank all the members of the committee 1 for their work on this, and I'll turn to my colleagues to see if there are comments before 2 we, you know, take final action on this. So, Councilmember Leventhal, and then 3 Councilmember Ervin. 4 5 6

COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

Well, I appreciate the Council President's suggestion, and I think it's a good resolution to the issue. I'm just trying to clarify-- with respect to an alternative hiring mechanism, vis-avis a hiring preference, which is it that the Charter amendment is required to affect? That's the special hiring-- the hiring mechanism that bypasses the merit system? Is that correct?

10 11 12

7

8

9

LESLIE RUBIN:

Deleted: ?????:

Deleted: ?????

Correct.

13 14

COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

So that's what the Charter amendment would bring about.

16 17 18

15

LESLIE RUBIN:

Correct. The hiring--

19 20 21

COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

But the hiring preference we could do by law as soon as we were able to get a bill drafted and enacted?

23 24 25

27 28

29

30

31

32 33

34 35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

22

LESLIE RUBIN;

Deleted: ?????

26 Yes.

COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

OK. I just wanted to clarify that. Earlier this year, my colleagues will remember, I introduced legislation that would have reduced the number of boards and commissions in the County from 83 to 72. The Commission on--and the Council had zero interest in taking any action whatsoever on that legislation, and nothing happened. I mean, we clarified some language, but we didn't eliminate any boards and commissions. I still think we have some boards and commissions in the County that have some redundancy, but I never proposed to do anything with the Commission on People with Disabilities, and I've been to visit the Commission on People with Disabilities a number of times, have gotten excellent suggestions from the commission that I have worked with my colleagues to effectuate, and we've had--I think it has been one of the best commissions in terms of substantive recommendations for policy initiatives that this Council has been able to act on, so look forward to working with the new chair and continuing to work with the continuing commissioners. We've been in close contact. Similarly, I think the Charter Review Commission performs a valuable role for us in reviewing legal precedents and questions



that we might not consider. So I think--so by--by sending this to the Charter Review Commission, it in no way diminishes our interest in improving the track record of the County in hiring people with disabilities and providing opportunities for employment for people under those circumstances. But we do need to acknowledge that we have these boards and commissions, and specifically the role of this one is to advise us on Charter amendments like this one, so if we were to bypass them, that would not-- that would not enable them to fulfill their function, and they do have an important function, so I'm delighted to second and support the Council President's suggestion in that regard.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

OK. Thank you, Chair Leventhal. Councilmember Ervin.

COUNCILMEMBER ERVIN:

Thank you very much. I'd like to just take this opportunity to thank Council President Andrews and Councilmember Trachtenberg for their leadership on this issue, but essentially to the Office of Legislative Oversight, who brought us this extraordinary report. And every now and then, the Council actually does do good work on behalf of the citizens of Montgomery County, and today is going to be one of those days that a problem was identified, a lot of people worked on it, we had a lot of back-and-forth conversations on the best approaches, and I for one am very proud of what we're about to do here today. And for Mr. Maxin, you are an extraordinary advocate. We never met except for a few minutes ago this morning, and so hopefully we'll get a chance to get to know each other better. But as someone who really came out of the tail end of the civil rights movement, I think that this is one of those opportunities that a local jurisdiction can stand up on behalf of people with disabilities in a way that's quite extraordinary, I think. So I'm very proud of what we're about to do, and it's-- you know, thank you all for your advocacy.

MARK MAXIN:

Thank you.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you, Councilmember Ervin. Council Vice President Berliner.

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

Mr. Chairman, your comments were quite eloquent, and we thank you for them. You gave expression in ways in which I had never heard and was really very powerful and evocative, and thank you for doing so.

MARK MAXIN:

40 Thank you.

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:



My colleagues know that for two summers, I had a person with disabilities as an intern, and--Aaron Kaufman, who is just an extraordinary young man that I know you're familiar with--and I will say to you, it does present challenges, and it's important for us to recognize it does present challenges. Simply finding a good space for him and having a place for him to get to with his wheelchair in our office was very difficult. Making sure that when we had a fire drill--that, oh, my goodness, somebody making sure that Aaron is taken care of. And through it all, the consciousness that I think we all gained by his just being with us was so valuable in the way in which you gave expression to--just knowing that we are one, he is us, and we can't have this kind of division between. So my hope is that my colleagues and I will continue our own efforts--that this isn't really just about the Executive branch, that we have our own affirmative obligation to reach out and to ensure that we're doing all we can do for our disabled community to have them be part of us and teach us all the things that they have to teach us. Thank you.

1415 MARK MAXIN:

Thank you.

16 17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28 29

30

31

32 33

34 35

36

37

38 39

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

OK. And thank you very much for those eloquent comments, Vice President Berliner. So I sense that there's no opposition to the recommendation to move forward with establishing a hiring preference for people with disabilities that are qualifying for the highest category-rating category that is being considered for the position. And with that assent, I'm going to ask our Council staff to-- our Council lawyers to draft legislation that would get the ball rolling, and most likely require that the Executive branch develop regulations to implement a hiring preference. So my hope is that we can have that legislation ready for introduction next Tuesday to get the ball moving, and I very much appreciate the hard work that has been done by all the people that have been mentioned by many already: the Office of Legislative Oversight; the Commission on People with Disabilities, which is definitely one of our hardest-working and best commissions; our Council staff who have worked on this issue: the committee, which met I think 5--5 times on this. 6 times on this. to really go through these recommendations carefully. And there are some other recommendations I should acknowledge that are in the letter from the Commission on People with Disabilities that we should not ignore and that we will work on, as well, as well as doing our part here at the County Council to--to set an example. So with that, I want to note that this is a milestone in the County's efforts to provide better opportunities for people with disabilities, and I look forward to working with all my colleagues in the coming months to--to implement these-- these recommendations that the Council is adopting today. Thank you all, and with that, I think we can move on to our vote. We'll have a vote on acceptance of the recommendations. All those in favor, please raise your hands. And that is unanimous. Thank you.

40 41 42

MARK MAXIN:

16



1 Thank you so much.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

And good to see you all. Have a happy Thanksgiving.

CINDY BUDDINGTON:

7 Happy Thanksgiving.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

We're going to move on to our final item for the morning, and that is an update on the County income tax revenue situation. We--we got some very bad news last week about income tax revenues for the November installment. We heard that they are down 85 million from what they were expected to be, a decline of 28% from the estimated amount -obviously, a huge number, and one that we need to figure out how to address as a County as we go forward. So I'm going to first turn to Council Staff Director Steve Farber, who is our resident fiscal expert over here, to make any opening comments he'd like to make, and I'll turn to our Executive branch representatives--Jennifer Barrett, director of finance, and David Platt, our economist --County economist. Mr. Farber.

STEPHEN FARBER:

Thank you, Mr. Andrews. As you know, a week from today, December 1, we're going to have a complete fiscal update. The last Council update was on September 29. You requested, however, that we have this discussion today about the latest income tax distribution and its implications for the balance of this fiscal year and next because, as you noted, the distribution was so much lower than expected. It was expected to be about 305 million. It turned out to about 220 million--\$85 million less-- and there are implications for this year and for next year that make our budget challenges all the greater. We are going to have the full discussion of the fiscal update next week, but Finance Director Jennifer Barrett is here, along with Chief Economist David Platt. Joe Beach, director of OMB, has also joined us, and Alex Espinosa, director--the operating budget coordinator-- is also with us today. So with that, Miss Barrett?

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

34 Thank you, Mr. Farber. Good to see you, Miss Barrett.

JENNIFER BARRETT:

37 Good to see you.

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

40 Being sarcastic?

JENNIFER BARRETT:

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28 29

30

31

32 33

34 35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42



I understand. We're happy to provide this information. I will precede it by saying that the November distribution is very important to us. We've been saying that to the Council for some time, because it is the largest distribution that we get of the income tax, which, as we all know, is collected by the state and then distributed out to the counties. It is the primary distribution of receipts from October 15 filings related to tax year 2008. It is also the--includes the third quarter withholdings and estimated payments from tax year 2009. The fact is that when we get income tax distributions, they sometimes cover 3 tax years. It's a very complex timing adjustments of when we get information, and so while we're going to focus today on this November distribution, it is something that needs to be-- it's only one distribution. We're looking over that information in the context of the overall tax picture, and that's what we will be bringing to you next week with the overall revenue update. I'll note that I just this morning received the information from the state confirming the distribution amounts that we receive, so it is public information now to all the counties. I will tell you that we are not alone, that we had severe, across--almost across-the- board reductions for all the counties in Maryland, so we'll be hearing things from the challenges that everyone in the state is facing. I think there is only one small county with an increase in this distribution and a couple of jurisdictions where the adjustment that the state made didn't even cover the full adjustment the state needs to make to their distributions. What's going on is that the November distribution, in terms of those October 15 filings, except for some additional filings we'll get in January, but they're a very small portion--it's a time of truing up tax year 2008 in terms of the overall income of the state and the income tax receipts of the state. In that way, the state now has that information about tax year 2008. Before now, they've only had the information--the full information about tax year 2007, and a large portion of our distributions-- withholdings and estimated payments--have been made based on that 2007 information. So the two-part impact of this November distribution is this truing up of 2008 in terms of the October 15 filings, but they go back and make the adjustment related to the overall tax year of 2008. But the other impact is that they now take this new information about 2008 and apply it to our withholdings and estimated payments immediately--no delay. So there was also a reduction in our third quarter distribution for the current tax year. And in times when--as in the past, when we've experienced very large revenue growth-- and next week, we'll show you some charts showing some of the trends over the years so you can put it in context--you know, we get more money. The adjustment is an upward adjustment. This time, it was a downward adjustment. So just to get into a little bit of specifics about this distribution. AS we mentioned, the first part, the October 15 filings and adjustments, we had anticipated this trend. We had anticipated the adjustment and had included in the estimated number for this portion of the distribution a 60.5% decrease. What we got, though, was a 93% decrease. So we had tried to take into account--and I think that others are going to be in the same situation, where we tried to make the assessment accurately, but it was just far more than anybody expected. As I said, we're seeing it across the board, across the state, for all the jurisdictions. So that reduction from what we expected was 48 million, 48.1. In terms of the withholdings and estimated payments, because they made this adjustment

18



related on 2008 versus prior, they had been distributed based on 2007, we had anticipated pretty much a flat adjustment from actual '09 to the estimated FY10, and in fact, they took \$30 million out of it --a 13% reduction to that piece of the distribution. That was another 37.1 million. So the two dollar amounts--a \$48 million cut, a \$37 million cut -- that's where you get the \$85 million reduction in this distribution. Overall, the distribution is down 43% from last year's distribution. Overall--what we do know, though, is our 2008 tax-the technical word is liability. The income tax receipts for 2008 are down 11% from tax receipts for 2007. And that's the overall factor that's going to be affecting our revenue projections going forward, and it's sobering, and it's--it's more than we had expected, quite frankly. So that's what we'll be bringing back to you next week, is how this information we learned from this distribution affects the overall revenue picture for income taxes. And it's also the time of year when we do the overall November update of other revenue sources that we do the projections on.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

OK. Does anybody want to add anything? No. OK. All right. Well, obviously, this is very --you know, been very bad news, and it's a large reduction in what was expected. And the Council is scheduled to have a full fiscal update next week, as you noted, and we'll learn more about the other aspects of the fiscal picture at that time. But given the magnitude of this shortfall, what is the--what does the Executive branch plan to do from this point in responding to it and reacting to it and absorbing it or finding ways to reduce spending by whatever amount the Executive branch thinks is necessary to avoid going unnecessarily into reserves?

JENNIFER BARRETT:

It's early on, and I--we are working actively on the plan going forward, and I'll let Joe add anything that we wants. I will say that from the finance director perspective, this 85 million--we were ahead just a little bit before now. I mean, that's--part of our conundrum is that actually we were just a little bit ahead-- by about 10 million, I think, to date in income-tax distribution--so we didn't have a real heads-up that this was going to happen in the November distribution, past what we had already anticipated. My concern is that this 85 million at least is going to be a problem for the current year. And remember, we've reduced reserves. We're at 5%, not 6%. A large portion of that--more than half of that--is in the Revenue Stabilization Fund, so -- and that's something that really should be a last resort. So I can say that we are going to have to actively work to make some adjustments in the current year, because reserves will not handle the overall picture that we're going to see. And from a finance director perspective, I'm also very concerned about cash flow. I've got to tell you that having lower reserves is-- there is--there are other impacts in terms of just keeping the money moving, because there's a lot of timing differences between the appropriation years and when cash actually goes out the door. So we've got some serious challenges for the current fiscal year, and obviously that 11% reduction from '07 to '08 tax



years has implications for future income tax revenues for the County, because we're not seeing a V-shaped recovery, as you all know well.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Mr. Beach?

JOE BEACH:

Yeah. I don't-- at this point, don't have a lot to add, but we're just looking at a lot of different options. We're working with our department heads right now, sort of giving them the same kind of briefing that we're giving you now and getting their ideas, as well as developing some other options. So needless to say, we'll be back to the Council with more details later. I'm sure not next week a complete plan, but in the near future.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Of course, the sooner the better, because there's more opportunity to save money the longer in the year there is to implement the savings. So we--we would expect to, you know, see some recommendations in the near future, and the sooner the better. What do-what would be-- what do we expect the impact of these reductions to be on the FY11 budget in terms of--what does it portend for income tax revenues?

JENNIFER BARRETT:

Since we're talking about the income tax, we know that now for the rest of 2009, the state will be making its distributions of withholdings and estimated payments based on that lower allocation to Montgomery County that's 11% lower than 2007, based on the 2008 tax year. That will extend through our fourth-quarter distribution and our first- and second-quarter distributions next year, so until they get full 2009 information--tax revenue information--that will affect the third-quarter distribution next year. So we-- this isn't going to be corrected anytime soon in terms of the income tax portion of our revenue stream. And I will mention that-- we've already mentioned to Council, and it's no surprise, we still haven't seen a rapid increase in inflation. Inflation is still at least flat, if not negative. So remember, we talked about that that has an impact on property tax revenues under the Charter limit for next year. So those are two places I can say, yes, it has serious impacts going forward, and we'll bring you more information on that next week.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Right. Prior to the Savings Plan being adopted, the gap was projected to be about 365 million, and then the Savings Plan knocks 30 million off that, presumably, taking it down to about 335, but as you just noted, the current estimate for property taxes at the Charter limit for next year is based on an inflation rate of 3% or 4%. Inflation is essentially nonexistent, which means that the--being at the Charter limit next year would mean 45 million less than is currently projected, which means that gap is now back up to about 380



before this impact. So that's, I think, a rough estimate of where we are at the moment, and 1 2 that may be a best-case estimate of where we are at the moment. 3 JENNIFER BARRETT: 4 5 And you add to that, this, and this happening again next year, at least. We'll be coming back with more information next week. 6

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

- All right. I'll turn to my colleagues. Council Vice President Berliner, and then 9
- Councilmember Floreen and Councilmember Elrich. And then Councilmember 10 11

Trachtenberg.

12 13

7

8

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

- Appreciate this heads-up. It obviously does not bode well for our County. We are clearly 14 15 talking about an additional Savings Plan, as I understand it. Is that fair characterization,
- 16 Mr. Beach?

17

JOE BEACH: 18

I think so, yes.

19 20 21

22

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

And my understanding is that we are talking something in the order of as much as \$70 million in a potential Savings Plan?

23 24 25

JOE BEACH:

It would be an aggressive target, given the current year shortfall we're looking at. I'd like to stay away from a specific number at this point, but it would be an aggressive target.

27 28 29

26

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

It's bigger than a breadbox.

30 31

JOE BEACH: 32

33 It's very large.

34

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

35 36 Mr. Farber, have we ever done anything--has the Council done a midyear Savings Plan of that magnitude, in addition to the 30 we've done previously? This is truly extraordinary, is 37 it not? 38

39 40

STEPHEN FARBER:



Yes. We have, on occasion, done a second midyear Savings Plan when circumstances have required it. I recall once or twice when that has happened in the past. But we've never done anything of this magnitude.

4 5

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

So this is going to be quite a challenge for you, it's going to be quite a challenge for us, to find those kinds of savings midyear. Our options aren't--we don't have a lot of options here.

9 10

JOE BEACH:

You're correct. It'll be a huge challenge, and as Mr. Andrews noted, the longer you go in the fiscal year, the less discretion, less flexibility you have. A lot of commitments are made in terms of hiring and contracting, and that's why we're meeting with our department heads to make sure that they understand the urgency and the implications of this information.

15 16

17

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

Mr. Farber indicates that we're well over 500 million projected for FY 11 in terms of our budget deficit. I'm of the view that seems to be on the low side. Can you give us your view as to whether or not that 500 million is on the low side? Are we going to be up to 600 million?

22 23

24

25

JOE BEACH:

I'd like to save any specific numbers for next week's update so we have all the accurate information, but it would be a very high target. I'd expect it may be even more than what we were looking at this time last year.

26 27 28

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

And that was how much, this time last year?

29 30

31 JOE BEACH:

32 About 515 million, I believe, was the gap last year.

33

34 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

35 OK.

36

STEPHEN FARBER:

Yes. Mr. Berliner, what I've indicated is that these income-tax changes that Miss Barrett has described alone bring us, I think, well over 500 million.

40

37

41 COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

42 Thank you.

2



STEPHEN FARBER:

That's before what Mr. Andrews talked about in terms of the Charter limit, where we'll lose another 45 million, and there are other factors that I identify in a footnote on the second page of my memo that could drive that still higher. So I would agree with you-- we're talking about a very large number.

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

Clearly probably closer to 600 million than to 500 million before we're through with this. I think my colleagues and I and you--we have our work cut out for us here. This isgoing to be very tough--tough year for all of us. Thank you.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

14 Thank you, Council Vice President Berliner. Councilmember Floreen.

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

Thank you. Mr. Farber and Miss Barrett, would you say that--that what this evidences is what we--sort of the reality check hitting local governments, the delayed reality that we end up experiencing with respect to tax revenue because we've been assuming our revenues based on 2007 numbers? Is that really what we're seeing here?

JENNIFER BARRETT:

We were making assumptions and projections here in Montgomery County based on more current information.

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

Sure.

JENNIFER BARRETT:

And that's why we had already anticipated some of this reduction--60% reduction--over last year. But the state--it's a factor of how they technically do their distributions. They don't try to make their own projections. They use actual 2007 data. And they noted that they thought we were over-distributed, but, like I said, we had factored that in. I would also say that Montgomery County is 30% of the state's income tax. So we specifically get hit extraordinarily, and the impact on us may also be tilted because of the higher income taxpayers. We don't have information on that yet. We obviously want to know more because of our--you know, the folks that are over 500,000. But that's also a piece of the impact here in Montgomery County.

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

So it's Montgomery County's contribution to the state--I mean, this is a statewide issue, obviously.



1
2

2 JENNIFER BARRETT:

It is a statewide issue.

3 4 5

6

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

But it's allocated--we contribute 30%, and they taketh away 30%, in effect--well, more than that, under these numbers, right?

7 8 9

JENNIFER BARRETT:

Yeah. Remember, I'm talking about just the November distribution, where they took away 93% compared to last year.

12 13

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

14 Yeah. It's--

15 16

JENNIFER BARRETT:

But that's just one piece of the distribution, and it has that true-up for the year, so you can't just take that number and extrapolate it. I'm sorry, but it's just one impact here.

18 19 20

21

17

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

Got that. So, are you able to distinguish, in the distribution numbers, the 2008 income returns and the 2009-- the quarter numbers?

22 23 24

JENNIFER BARRETT:

Yeah. Those are the two pieces I talked-- I gave you specific numbers.

25 26 27

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

Those are--they're combined. Are you seeing different percentages in each category? I mean, are you able to say, "Well, 2009, this quarter is X percent different from 2008, this quarter"? Are you able to compare those?

31 32

JENNIFER BARRETT:

33 34 35 For some pieces of it.

36 So that's not easy to do.

37 38

JENNIFER BARRETT:

- But others, because it hasn't--it's not a useful percentage change. It's the withholdings and the estimated payments where that's kind of the stream. That's the piece that we can kind
- the estimated payments where that skind of the stream. That's the piece that we can kind
- 41 of watch trends better than the other pieces which have to do with when people file,
- 42 extensions, et cetera.

24



COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

Sure, sure.

JENNIFER BARRETT:

So the withholding and estimated payments was down 13% compared to last year.

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

OK. Well, we will obviously want a very--have a very thorough conversation of all this next week. I very much appreciate the Council President putting this on today so we could ask at least some--a few preliminary questions, and I suspect we'd like to work with the Executive staff on a rather--I think we're going to need a pretty aggressive response to this as soon as possible. So we will keep talking, won't we? OK. Thank you very much.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you, Councilmember Floreen. Councilmember Elrich, and then Councilmember Trachtenberg, then Councilmember Navarro.

COUNCILMEMBER ELRICH:

So will we get details on what categories of income are vanishing, rather than just the gross number? Will we actually get breakdowns by--by income group?

DAVID PLATT:

Are you talking about income class, Mr. Elrich?

COUNCILMEMBER ELRICH:

27 Yeah.

DAVID PLATT:

They'll give us a report--probably either the end of December or early January, they'll give us a report for 2008, and they'll break it down by income category--the adjusted gross income.

COUNCILMEMBER ELRICH:

And when you bring the--when we come next week and have the full discussion, I've always been... I've always wondered which numbers to be following, because we tend to come in with this projected budget based on projected expenses, and we all know we're not going to do that, so--I mean, I just think we ought to focus on-- at least, I want to focus on what's the difference between where you thought you were going, not the historical trends, and what the gap looks like according to that. Because it's kind of--in previous years of doing this, I've wondered, you know, which is the real number, and I think we just ought to deal with what's the--not the historical basis, but what are you actually planning



for next year, and how short are we? And I guess I was wondering, what is--when we talk about the rainy day money or, you know, the reserves, so what is the crisis that triggers--I 2 3 mean, this can't be like the state situation with Maintenance of Effort, where it was described as if the state got hit by a tsunami and everything got swept away, they might 4 make a determination that we've reached, you know, some loss of a job base that can't be 5 quickly recovered. I mean, so what's the thinking about when, you know, their visit to 6 those funds are merited? I mean, there's a lot of talk about this being cyclical and a lot of 7 hand-wringing over making really, really drastic cuts for what's basically a cyclical 8 problem. And if people really think that the cycle comes to an end and has some 9 reasonable hope of recovery, it seems to me that portends one path you take regarding 10 11 reserves, or if you think that it's really going to be a lagging, miserable recovery for a long period of time, then maybe that takes a different approach. But I'd kind of like to get a 12 13 sense of what the thinking is on when those funds get touched.

14 15

1

COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

When is it a rainy day?

16 17 18

COUNCILMEMBER ELRICH:

Yeah. When does it rain?

19 20 21

COUNCILMEMBER LEVENTHAL:

I am looking out the window. It's--it's raining.

22 23 24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32 33

JENNIFER BARRETT:

It's rather complex, so if we could, we'll bring it back to you next week because it's X number of months and this particular indicator, and there's 3 different indicators, and it's-it's in law. But I will say that because when we talk about reserves here, we--the Council-sorry, the County is using a combination, a policy that combines the rainy day fund with the General Fund reserves; therefore, if you touch the rainy day fund, then we'll just simply be in a position of having to make that up on the General Fund side to makereach our reserve level policy. So there--you can access the money. It's kind of a fund of last resort, in my view, in terms of drawing from it, but even if you draw from it, you're going to have to fill it up on the other side of the equation, which is the General Fund, to reach whatever--our 6% fund balance policy, which we only hit 5% for the current budget vear.

COUNCILMEMBER ELRICH:

But, I mean, if the purpose of having those reserves is not just to have money sitting in the bank, it's in order to enable us to do things or avoid things--

39 40 41

38

JENNIFER BARRETT:

26



Again, it also--the one other key aspect, it is for unfunded appropriations. It is for when we don't have money--other monies in other funds to pay for things that we have appropriations for.

COUNCILMEMBER ELRICH:

But isn't that the definition of our situation, when our money vanishes and we don't have the money to pay for things that we --we're going to appropriate for?

JENNIFER BARRETT:

It is appropriate fiscal practice for us to everything we can to avoid that situation without jumping--without drawing from the rainy day fund.

COUNCILMEMBER ELRICH:

I'm not suggesting that that's a place to jump to, but I think it's really important for us to have some clarity about how this plays out in the cycle--that if you draw down, for example, this year, and we don't replenish, what are the implications for next year? What is the, you know--what is the real implication for cash flow, for example? Because I think this is a time when, you know, we're going to have to make some really difficult decisions, and I think we've got to understand the mechanics of this rather than, you don't what to do that, or you don't want to go there. I mean, I want to understand why I don't want to go there, and maybe understanding all of that will help us and everybody else who's looked at it-- looking at this--understand that we do have real limitations on where we can move. I mean, I do know that if you pull this down too low and you're expecting a repeat next year of this year, there may be nowhere to go next year, and you don't want to be in the situation where there's no place to go, but I'd like to at least get a sense of how this plays out, to the best of your ability. And I do appreciate that-- that you all did anticipate a drop in revenues, and certainly no one is going to accuse you of underestimating the revenues this year. That's one argument we will not be listening to.

JENNIFER BARRETT:

Thank you.

STEPHEN FARBER:

On that point, Mr. Elrich, the rainy day fund, the Revenue Stabilization Fund, as Miss Barrett said, is a very important foundation of our reserves. We've already taken the total reserves of the rainy day fund plus the undesignated reserves down from 6% to 5%, and as Miss Barrett said, the really--the key criterion is when appropriations become unfunded. That's the key provision in the law. In 1992, we actually almost got there. We didn't have a rainy day fund then. That started only in 1994. But at that time, we took our reserves down to just about \$2 million, and we were really on fumes at that time, as folks who were here then remember. We do have the rainy day fund now. It's very important from the standpoint of our overall fiscal health. And yes, it is raining. It's more than

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

26 27

28 29

30

31

32 33

34 35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42



drizzling and it's more than a light rain, but the question is, is it really that devastating rain that--that we guard against and the reason that we have a rainy day fund in the first place.

COUNCILMEMBER ELRICH:

I guess I suppose the definition will be when we see the cut list that accompanies this 85 million and then the cut list that accompanies next year's budget. Maybe we'll decide how heavy it's raining. But, you know, what we haven't said anything about is this little elephant in the room of the fine for the schools, because if--on top of making this unexpected disastrous cut, if in fact the school system gets fined substantially and we can't go beyond the cut we're making, and we're making that cut just to stay even, it has real serious implications for the school system. I mean, it's almost like saying right now, we might actually have to figure out if we wanted to maintain even the current level of funding at schools. This isn't an \$85 million problem. This could be as much as a \$135 million staring--problem starting at us right now. And that's--I mean, I just find that scary as a midyear adjustment. And I think all of us feel that there's not a lot of fatback in the budget that we can easily go after and say, you know, "Here are some simple programs you can discontinue." I think we really are talking about a painful situation for everybody.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you, Councilmember Elrich. Councilmember Trachtenberg.

COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

Thank you, President Andrews. Well, this is an important conversation, and obviously, the information that has been provided this morning is sobering, at best. And I would suggest that it's certainly pouring, and I think a flood is about to occur. And what I'm referencing is really the national conversation that's occurring right now about employment and the fact that we're likely to see a second phase around unemployment figures, and that will even put us, I think, in a more difficult spot--not just in terms of revenue but, quite frankly, in terms of need. So my question, really, to you --all of you this morning-- is twofold. One is, can we talk a little bit about some of those things that we are anticipating for next year? Because while we can't say with certainty what is going to occur, there's certainly detail on the footnote, the second one on page 2, about all the things that we face and the implications of those factors on what we are charged with for the following year. And I'm specifically referring to not only the Maintenance of Effort, but the state cuts, round 3, the implications--we don't, again, know what the governor's budget is going to look like, but we certainly know some of what's being talked about. And when you put all that together with the write-downs on County revenues, you know, we are looking at a significant hole. In the packet that was provided to us, it's defined as perhaps in the neighborhood of 500 million, but in my mind, I actually think that number actually might be larger than that. And one of the things that I believe we're going to have to talk about eventually, and maybe in the short term, is really priorities, because surely we're not going to have enough money to do the things we want to do or even, frankly, that we have to do. And I've been asking

25



for that conversation, which I know is going to be painful, but I think it's really important to have it in the short term, because I think that's the only way that we're going to get through next year. And I would hope that as this Council continues to work with the Executive branch and as the numbers become more evident, that we start having some of those conversations, because I'm sure as this becomes more public knowledge, there will be requests provided to us as legislators on what those priorities look like, because that's directly related to the pot of money that is dwindling and how we are going to best invest it on behalf of those that we serve and that we represent. So I would hope that after the holiday break, one of the first things we're able to do is really set up a discussion around priorities and how do we define them collectively. And perhaps we could do that through MFP, but it would seem to me, given the gravity, the magnitude of the problem that we're facing, that it's probably best to have that conversation before the full Council.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you, Chair Trachtenberg. And our final comment this morning will be Councilmember Navarro.

COUNCILMEMBER NAVARRO:

Thank you. I guess really kind of piggybacks on what Councilmember Trachtenberg was talking about in terms of setting priorities. Mr. Beach, you said that you have started conversations with department heads about the gravity of the situation. So I was just curious to know sort of what is the general sense there, what exactly-- what conversations that you're having, and also, obviously, when we come back, if you could be a little more specific about, you know, some of the things that the department heads are having to deal with and what are some of the sort of general direction that you have provided them, so that we can marry to hopefully a conversation around priorities and see how together we can navigate this terrible time.

JOE BEACH:

30 OK.

COUNCILMEMBER NAVARRO:

I mean, any--

JOE BEACH:

At this point, I mean, it's very early. We have not--I mean, we're looking for ideas from them. I can say based on our experience last year, we had great collaboration from our department heads. I think they understood the gravity of the situation. We were able to make some significant reductions of the budget without service reductions. But I think what they're facing this year is a very constrained situation where they're carrying out largely the same mission with less resources. That's a lot of strain on the staff right now, and so, obviously, we can't speak in specifics now, but it would be hard to come up with



even a '10 or a--revised FY10 or FY11 budget that did not involve some significant service reductions.

2 3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

1

COUNCILMEMBER NAVARRO:

Thank you. And I guess when we do come back, I mean, I'm really always interested in how do we address some of these issues in terms of same level of service, you know, through collaboration and resource sharing and things of that nature, so however we're able to capture that in some of these conversations. I think now more than ever, it's time to really, you know, put our money where our mouth is in terms of collaboration to see how we can continue to provide these type of services, especially when it comes to the safety net, because that's the piece that keeps me awake at night--is that at the same time that we're talking about these horrific times, we know that more than ever, people who may not have--look toward local government for assistance. You know, they have to now. And so, how do we kind of reconcile those two? So I look forward to that.

14 15 16

17 18

JOE BEACH:

That's an excellent point, because not only are they carrying out the same mission with less staff, actually they have a greater mission, and there's a greater strain and demand for services, as well.

19 20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28 29

30

31

32 33

34 35

36

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you, Councilmember Navarro. And so what I--what I heard from the Executive branch representatives was that we're likely to see a proposed Savings Plan that is substantially larger than the one that we just approved two weeks ago, a week ago, and the sooner we get that, the more impact it will have in terms of the amount of time it can take effect. So as has been the case over the past few months, I know that we'll continue to work closely with the Executive branch on ideas for that and-- so that we can respond appropriately and in a timely way to this very bad news, to do what we need to to respond to it, to find the additional cuts and savings, and to put in place for FY11 ideas that can help us address what will clearly be a very large gap for FY11 that just got a lot larger. So on that, thank you for coming over today, and next week, the Council is scheduled to have a full briefing on the fiscal plan overall--fiscal outlook overall--which I'm sure will be at least as sobering, and then--but in the meantime, I want to wish people who are here, who are listening, a happy Thanksgiving. And we're going to recess and then come back--the Council will come back for about half an hour at 1:30 for public hearings. We have 8 speakers and action on the final item. So I anticipate about half an hour this afternoon before we adjourn around 2. So again, thank you all, and we'll see you back here at 1:30.

37 38



COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

2 Good afternoon, everybody, and welcome to the afternoon session of the County Council.

We have several public hearings, and then the last public hearing also has action

4 afterwards. The first public hearing is on Bill 34-09, Forest Conservation - Enforcement,

5 and combines actually -- is combined with 2 other items, Zoning Text Amendment 09-09

6 and the Subdivision Regulation Amendment 09-03. Bill 34-09, Forest Conservation -

7 Enforcement,

8

10

11

15

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28 29

30

31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40 41

42

would amend the forest conservation law to modify the number of required inspections

9 and the notification period for inspections, specify the penalty procedures for violations of

the forest conservation law, modify the hearing procedures for violations of the forest

conservation law, and generally amend the forest conservation law. A T&E Committee

12 worksession is tentatively scheduled for Monday, November 30, 2009, at 9:30, and I

13 believe that's still planned. And then there's -- this is also a public hearing on Zoning Text

14 Amendment 09-09, Planning Board Enforcement, that would revise provisions for

violations, penalties, and enforcement of a Planning Board action and generally amend

16 the provisions related to violations of the zoning ordinance. A PHED Committee

worksession will be scheduled at a later date. And finally, this is also a public hearing on

18 Subdivision Regulation Amendment 09-03, Enforcement - Amendments, that would revise

19 the procedures to enforce a Planning Board action and generally amend the provisions for

the procedures to enforce a Flaming Board action and generally affects the provisions for

issuance, enforcement, and appeals of Planning Board actions. A PHED Committee

worksession will be scheduled at a later date. Persons wishing to submit additional

material for the Council's consideration on any of these items should do so before the

close of business on Wednesday, November 25, 2009. Because we're combining these 3

items, I will allow speakers to go over by a little bit if they need to to get their testimony in,

over the normal 3 minutes -- but not by too much. So try to -- try to get it done in 3, but if

you need a few extra seconds, you'll have it. The speakers for this public hearing are

Royce Hanson, representing the Montgomery County Planning Board, Judy Koenick,

speaking as an individual, Norman Knopf, speaking as an individual, and David Brown,

speaking as an individual. If you have any written testimony, please give it to the clerk,

and please remember to introduce yourself at the beginning of your testimony. Mr.

Hanson, you're first.

ROYCE HANSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm Royce Hanson, chairman of the Montgomery County Planning Board. You have a longer statement on these 3 enforcement provisions. Bill 34-09, ZTA 09-09, and SRA 09-03 are a package of enforcement rules that provide the necessary support for effective enforcement programs to assure the public that project plans, preliminary plans, site plans, water quality plans, forest conservation plans, and all other Planning Board- approved plans will be implemented as intended in an efficient and consistent manner. It assures due process to alleged violators and maintains a level of transparency not necessarily available through District Court review by providing notice to the public of the hearings and an opportunity for interested parties to be heard before

3

This transcript has been prepared from television closed captioning and is not certified for its form or content. Please note that errors and/or omissions may have occurred.

Deleted: TRANSCRIPT¶ "November 24, 2009¶ MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL¶ PRESENT¶ Councilmember Phil Andrews, President¶ Councilmember Roger Berliner Councilmember Marc Elrich¶ Councilmember Valerie Councilmember Nancy Ervin Floreen Councilmember Michael Councilmember George Knapp Leventhal Councilmember Nancy Councilmember Duchy Trachtenberg¶ Section Break (Next Page)

■



compliance requirements are instituted by the board. This legislative package also 1 addresses difficulties with and conflicts in current law that have limited the effectiveness of 2 3 the Planning Board's enforcement program. The changes to the law and the enforcement rules are all interconnected and, if implemented together, will be the most effective means 4 of addressing previous difficulties with enforcement. SRA 09-03 would amend the 5 subdivision regulations. It allows the board to assess an administrative civil penalty at an 6 enforcement hearing in a fair and systematic way. It allows the Planning Board to decide 7 appeals of citations because the board has the authority to make all -- make decisions on 8 all aspects of a case at one sitting. Alleged violators can be heard in an informal 9 proceeding that saves both public and private resources and provides the public an 10 11 opportunity to be heard on any proposed compliance plan. Notices of violation are added 12 to give an alleged violator the opportunity to correct a violation before a civil fine is issued or a hearing occurs. It allows the Planning Board to designate a hearing officer with 13 subpoena power, to hold a full adjudicatory hearing, and submit a recommendation to the 14 15 board based on the findings of fact and applications of the law. The board retains the 16 ultimate responsibility to make the final decision and determine whether an administrative civil penalty, civil fine, compliance program, or other remedy is provided by law -- as 17 18 provided by law is appropriate. In all other public -- I'm sorry, ZTA 09-09 streamlines the 19 enforcement process by separating enforcement of the Planning Board actions from other 20 enforcement measures by the Department of Permitting Services. DPS would continue to 21 enforce zoning violations in the same manner as it does currently, but the Planning Board would have original jurisdiction over the enforcement of approved project plans, 22 23 preliminary plans, site plans, and other plans previously approved by the board. Bill 34-09, 24 if I can just take a few more seconds, would amend Chapter 22A to ensure consistency in 25 the enforcement process for all Planning Board actions. The bill also clarifies some of the ambiguities in the law and creates consistency between the law and administrative 26 27 process set forth in the forest conservation regulations that have already been reviewed and approved by the County Council -- the process that is being followed today. In 28 29 closing, this comprehensive enforcement legislation is tailored to increase the efficiency 30 and effectiveness of the board's enforcement of those matters within its jurisdiction and to 31 ensure greater transparency to the public of the enforcement program. Over the past 5 years, the community has expressed concern about loopholes in the board's enforcement 32 33 processes. The legislation in the current enforcement provision strengthens the current enforcement provisions, and it allows for public participation as plans are enforced and 34 35 considered for revision. We look forward to working with you in the achievement of this 36 important package of legislation.

37 38

39

40

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you, Chairman Hanson. Our next speaker is Judy Koenick. There you go. There you go. Move it toward you a little bit.

41 42

JUDY KOENICK:

32



I'm sorry. What?

1 2 3

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Just move the microphone right in front of you. There you go.

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28 29

30

31

32 33

34 35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

JUDY KOENICK:

Thank you. My name is Judy Koenick, and I'm testifying very quickly on all 3 of these. Unfortunately, your system is somewhat primitive. It would have been a lot simpler if I could simply have plugged in my Mac computer and do it that way, but you're PC blind. and I can't do it. I have an able assistant over here, I hope is going to -- the basic thing is, on the issue of forest conservation, if this applies to Park and Planning Commission, it would be great, if they only did it and complied and enforced their own selves. I mean, I find it difficult -- how are they going to bring themselves in and cite them? The same thing with a development plan. I have the development plan for Meadowbrook Stables, as well as the hearing that was held on December 6, 2001. There are major things that they say that they're going to do. They haven't done 90% of it, and as a result, they are out of compliance. In December -- excuse me, in 1990, they were told by Montgomery County to stop polluting the air. They have never done it. So the issue to me is, how will this make them do their job and enforce themselves and haul themselves in? They won't do it. I've been trying for years. Allegedly, they might be doing something next month, but do I hold my breath on it? Forget it. What I have here are some pictures to give you a brief idea, one of which is -- Well, here. She's going to put these up here. What this area I've marked shows you where the trees were at the stables before they came in and cut them down -a large forested area. This next one shows you what it looks like now. Can you turn it the other way so they can -- all right. All the way down from the bottom up past that rectangle on the left there, the trees are all gone. What they did is, they came in in the flood plain -keep in mind, this is the flood plain -- and cut down 75 mature trees. Then in their plan here they claimed that storm water would be able to flow through it. Well, I don't know how you can flow it through when you bring in hundreds of truckloads of fill and raise the area a distance of several hundred feet in both directions -- filling in the flood plain. To give you an idea what it looks like filled in, you'll see these 2 pictures -- next 2 pictures. You can see the elevation there from the curb, the height, and what they've gone to raise it all up there. This also shows you an extension of the height that they've done there. This will show you that this is in the flood plain. In fact, the whole area is in the flood plain. Now they've channeled the water because it cannot flow and spread out, as they claim in their document that it will do that. In addition, they do not control what goes into the creek. That's the mud sill and animal feces from the Meadowbrook Stables. That was taken this year. It flows in regularly from there because they don't take it out, and they allow it to get into the creek. I think the only reason they might be doing anything now at the point is because the President has said we're going to do something about the bay. Otherwise, at this point, for 20 years, I have seen them not give -- well, I have 2 little kids back there, so I won't use the other word. In addition, they also said that their new sprinkler system would

33



control the dust. This clearly shows you that it doesn't. EPA and your own health 1 department has come in and said that this type of situation is dangerous, but nothing is 2 done about it. So basically, what I'm saying is, Park and Planning Commission has this 3 grandiose idea as to what they're going to do to everybody else. They don't do it to 4 themselves, and you all have an obligation to see that they do. Mrs. Floreen, trying to not 5 get too personal on this -- your past employment in there to me raises guestions of 6 whether you can be objective on any of this, and your comment to me a couple of weeks 7 ago raised serious issues of whether or not you can be objective with anything involving 8 Park and Planning Commission, because when I tried to show you the issue of the dust, 9 you didn't see anything wrong with it. Thank you. 10

11 12

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

13 Thank you.

14 15

JUDY KOENICK:

And if you guys want a copy of this, you could pull it up off of their website. It's 200 and some pages.

17 18 19

16

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

OK. Thank you, Miss Koenick. Our next speaker will be Norman Knopf, who I don't see, and so I do see David Brown, and thus you're next.

21 22 23

24

25

26 27

28 29

30

31

32 33

34 35

36

37

38 39

40 41

42

20

DAVID BROWN:

Good afternoon, Mr. President and members of the board. I'm David Brown of the law firm of Knopf & Brown, and I welcome the opportunity to speak in support of SRA 09-03 and associate myself completely with the remarks by Chairman Hanson, as one who appears with some regularity, representing clients before the Planning Board. My partner could not be here this afternoon, but I know that he does not have any disagreement with my remarks, although I am just -- I'm not speaking for the firm. I'm speaking for myself. I don't have time to go through all of my testimony. I just want to highlight 2 points that I make in the testimony regarding this bill. First of all, I think it is a very welcome shift to have the site plan violation matters transferred from trials in the District Court to adjudications before the Planning Board and Hearing Examiners. Our busy and able District Court judges do not need to be burdened with delving into matters that call for the specialized expertise and judgment of the board. I think it will serve everyone perfectly well if the board's decisions in this area, like they are in almost every other development plan area, are potentially subject to judicial review at the Circuit Court level, where they can be looked at individually and in much greater detail than you could ever hope to get in a busy District Court. The other point I would make is that complementary with this change -which, by the way, is the way matters are handled under the Forest Conservation Act now -- there will be another way in which this bill will be modeled under the Forest Conservation Act. That act distinguishes between civil fines and penalties, and this bill

34



- also distinguishes between civil fines and penalties. A civil fine is punishment for violating 1 the law, whereas a civil penalty is imposed not as punishment, but as remediation to 2
- 3 address the violation itself. It's not hard to imagine a circumstance in which that would --
- that would be necessary. Imagine, for example, a developer builds a row of townhouses 2 4
- feet closer to the street than allowed under the -- under the site plan. The houses are up. 5
- It would be a huge economic waste to order those houses cut off in front and have to be 6
- moved back and shortened. Better to use the factor in the bill which talks about looking at 7
- the economic gain to the developer from --from committing the violation and imposing a 8
- penalty that's based on that, especially if it turns out that the action is willful, if the facts 9
- emerge that way. So we think that having this language in the bill itself will be a deterrent 10
- 11 to willful violations, and we may never have to get to the point where that will happen. It's
- 12 a welcome change. Thank you.

15

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

- Thank you, Mr. Brown. I have a couple of questions or comments. Councilmember
- 16 Floreen, and then Councilmember Knapp.

17 18

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

Thank you. Mr. Faden, are you handling this for the T&E Committee?

19 20 21

MICHAEL FADEN:

I'm handling the forest conservation bill, yes. Mr. Zyontz is handling the other 2 items.

22 23 24

25

26

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

The other 2. Could you all check in with the County Executive on this to see if there are any comments? I'd like to make sure we knew if they had any observations if we're going

27 to take this up on Monday.

28 29

MICHAEL FADEN:

30 We do have a memo from the County Attorney's office which came in a little late for this 31

packet but we'll put it in the packet for next week which raises some technical legal issues.

We don't have any memo from the Executive branch on policy grounds. 32

33

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN: 34

OK. All right. Well, we'll deal with it then. Thanks.

35 36 37

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you, Councilmember Floreen. Councilmember Knapp. 38

39 40

42

COUNCILMEMBER KNAPP:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just a couple of questions for when it comes to committee. One 41

is -- and I think for Park and Planning -- how -- the recommendation of a civil penalty in



excess of \$500 fine, how is that allowed, given the requirements under Article 28? And is a payment required as a penalty different than a fine, and if so, how? And then... It's my understanding, in Article 28, that there's is an element that says an individual who doesn't pay can be taken to court. How does the new process by which the Planning Board is recommending a step that goes before the Planning Board -- how does that work relative to what we've got in current law now? So we don't need to -- when we get to the -- when we get back to committee, we can go through all that, but those are some of the pieces to address.

8 9 10

1

2 3

4

5

6

7

ROYCE HANSON:

11 12 OK. We'll be ready to address those.

13

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

14 15 OK. Thank you, Chairman Knapp. Thank you, Chairman Floreen. And that concludes this public hearing, so thank you all, and happy Thanksgiving.

16 17

JUDY KOENICK:

18 Thank you for taking the time to talk to Alex and David yesterday.

19

20 21

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

22

Oh. Well, it's nice to see them again, and -- nice to see you guys.

23

JUDY KOENICK:

24 25 Figuring out how to get online, they're sitting there on my laptop playing computer games.

26

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

27 28 They're visiting from Florida. Nice to -- glad you're here, and have a -- have a happy Thanksgiving and a good trip back.

29

32

36

JUDY KOENICK:

30 31

In case you hadn't figured out...

Deleted: ?????¶

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

33

Very close. OK. All right. Our next public hearing will be a public hearing on an 34

35 amendment to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission's FY09-14

Capital Improvement Program for the South Germantown Recreational Park SoccerPlex

Facilities. A PHED Committee worksession is tentatively scheduled for Monday, 37

November 30, 2009, at 2:30 PM. That's the Planning, Housing, and Economic 38

- 39 Development Committee. Persons wishing to submit additional material for the Council's
- consideration should do so before the close of business on Wednesday, November 25, 40
- 2009. We have 2 speakers signed up for this public hearing. They are Royce Hanson, 41
- chairman of the Montgomery County Planning Board, and Robby Brewer, representing 42



Miracle League of Montgomery County, and if you have written testimony, please turn it in to the clerk to my left, and please remember to introduce yourself at the beginning of your testimony. Mr. Hanson, you're first.

3 4

1

2

ROYCE HANSON:

5 Thank you, and as before, I'm joined by our vice chair, Commissioner Wells-Harley, We're 6 requesting your approval for an amendment to the Capital Improvements Program for a 7 project entitled South Germantown Recreation Park: SoccerPlex Facilities to include 8 development of the first Miracle League fields in the state of Maryland. A miracle field is a 9 small baseball field specifically designed for physically and mentally challenged youth to 10 allow them to play baseball. The Department of Parks receives several unsolicited 11 12 proposals for public-private partnerships on park land every year. This one from the Miracle League of Montgomery County immediately stood out, and the Planning Board 13 enthusiastically approved the partnership on July 20 of this year. The only challenge was 14 15 finding the right site for the venue, and the department has done so. The Miracle League 16 is a national, nonprofit organization that has supported development of 200 Miracle League organizations across the country. Under the leadership of Dr. James Leder, 17 18 members of the Kiwanis Club of Bethesda formed the nonprofit Miracle League of Montgomery County to develop fields in the County. The Miracle League complex at 19 20 South Germantown will include two lighted miracle fields, a plaza with concession area, and parking with a drop-off area. The South Germantown Recreational Park: SoccerPlex 21 Facilities project, in the adopted CIP, authorized the development of a world-class soccer 22 23 complex, with multiple supporting and complementary recreational facilities. The Miracle 24 League fields are a perfect complement to this already-outstanding sports facility 25 designed to serve youth recreation needs. The site's adjacency to the Longview School at Spark Matsunaga Elementary School, which serves children with disabilities, is also a 26 27 plus. The SoccerPlex Complex as approved includes funding to construct a communityuse baseball/softball field at the southwest quadrant of Schaeffer Road and Germantown 28 29 Park Drive. The requested scope adds the development of the Miracle League complex 30 as a public-private partnership at the same site, on Field C. No additional public funding is 31 requested beyond what is already appropriated for Field C. The Miracle League of Montgomery County intends to fund development of the league's fields and supporting 32 33 infrastructure, as well as supporting funding for programming, operation, and maintenance of the fields. The County Department of Recreation has expressed strong interest in 34 35 participating in this partnership related to the programming of the fields. And the Maryland 36 Soccer Foundation supports -- fully supports this use of the park. Park staff held a community meeting at the SoccerPlex on June 18, where the project received broad 37 support. If this CIP amendment is approved, Parks will execute development and lease 38 39 agreements with the Miracle League of Montgomery County detailing the respective parties' obligations for design, construction, maintenance, and operation of the complex, 40 and the board asks the Council's support of this CIP amendment to allow this very 41 worthwhile partnership to proceed. Thank you. 42



4

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28 29

30

31

32 33

34 35

36

37

38

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you. Our next speaker will be Robby Brewer, representing Miracle League of Montgomery County.

5 6

ROBBY BREWER:

Thank you, Mr. Andrews, and good afternoon, members of the Council. I'm Robby Brewer, an attorney with Lerch, Early & Brewer in Bethesda. We represent, on a pro bono basis, the Miracle League for Montgomery County, and pleased to be here before you today. As Dr. Hanson indicated, the Miracle League of Montgomery County is a new nonprofit entity, formed about a year ago by the Kiwanis Foundation of Bethesda that's affiliated with the Kiwanis Club of Bethesda. The board members of Miracle League are also foundation board members, including me, and our president, Jim Leder, Dr. Jim Leder, a dentist, is here behind me. Jim, raise your hand. Jim has spearheaded most of the effort of this matter so far. Our Kiwanis Foundation was formed in 1950 in Bethesda and for many years has supported causes for disadvantaged youth in Montgomery County. That's its focus. About 2 years ago, we received a bequest from an estate from longtime members Sid and Roxy Hais. It was their request that approximately \$250,000, which was their bequest, be used to support youth baseball in Montgomery County. We thought long and hard about how we could do that, and this project will be their legacy. As Royce indicated, nationally, Miracle League has developed about 200 fields -- some are still under development -- where kids of all ages and disabilities are able to play baseball on a protected surface in a safe environment. And we're pleased to have this public-private partnership in Montgomery County to provide the first in the Washington Metropolitan area and, for that matter, the first in Maryland. We're well underway. We've hired landscape architect Grace Fielder and civil engineers to work on the design. We're about a third of the way through the design. The Parks Department is busy reviewing it. Michael Ma of the Parks Department, who is here today, has been our reviewer. If all goes well, we plan to finish the design and the permitting process in the spring, and if we can raise about a million dollars in construction and donated in-kind services and materials, we can then begin construction in the spring and open up next fall. As Dr. Hanson indicated, at the same time we build the Miracle League field, we will be building the Parks Department's youth baseball field. That's the CIP amendment that's before you today. So we have this public-private partnership and a joint development agreement where the public field gets built with public money, and the private field, the Miracle League field, is built with our resources. So we ask your support today in supporting the CIP amendment that has been introduced, and we will have the PHED Committee worksession, I believe, this coming Monday, and if there are any questions at that time or otherwise, we would be happy to address them. Thank you very much.

39 40 41

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

38



Thank you. Sounds like a very exciting proposal, very worthwhile. Council Vice President Berliner.

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

I don't have any questions with respect to this particular proposal. It does sound very worthy, and I commend you for bringing it forward and for your good work with respect to it. I do have a question on the broader question of public-private partnerships in our park system, which, as you know, has raised some issues in my community with respect to the Rockwood Manor possibilities. And the question that came to my mind was, the extent to which you step back and say, gee, if this park isn't doing what we want it to do, why not put out a Request for Proposals from everybody saying, what do you think we should do to improve our service here? As I understand it, in this context, you have a proposal from an entrepreneur who has ideas with respect to what should be done with this property, and you're going to assess that and come back to us with your recommendations with respect to it. But it felt to me to be a somewhat narrow conversation as to one particular proposal, as opposed to stepping back and saying, if it's not achieving everything we think it should achieve, what are we doing to solicit proposals for a range of ideas with respect to it? So I'm curious as to your thoughts, Mr. Chairman, with respect to your process of entertaining these kinds of concepts and whether my suggestion has any merit.

ROYCE HANSON:

Your suggestion has merit, and we do both. We do have a number of projects. In fact, we've got some RFPs out now for some facilities that are either underused or unused at this time and need, for their full opportunity to be achieved, probably some public-private arrangement. We also have an open door for unsolicited proposals. In the case of Rockwood, which you mentioned, this was an unsolicited proposal. When we have an unsolicited proposal, it's first of all reviewed by the staff, and I have to say that we received a good number of unsolicited proposals that do not even warrant bringing them to the board to see if we feel like it's something that's worth pursuing. As in the case of Rockwood, when we have a proposal that seems to have at least some merit, the idea usually is to have the Parks Department pursue some public outreach and input to determine whether or not there is a constituency for that idea, if it looks like it maybe is financially viable, and to determine whether there would be public support, both for whoever might be the constituency of that kind of a project and for the neighboring communities that could be impacted by it, and that's what happened with Rockwood. So there the effort was to reach out to the community to say, if this looked like it would be viable and a good use of this facility, is it something that you, the neighboring communities, would be comfortable with? And we expect to find that out as a result of these kinds of conversations. Now, once the outreach is complete, the staff will come back to the board with a recommendation, and we'll make a decision at that time as to whether this is suitable thing, even if people want it. So there -- because there are some things that might be suitable, might be financially desirable for a facility if we wanted to run



it as an enterprise, that still we might judge are not appropriate for park or for a particular park.

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

I guess it just seems to me that if you are going to entertain this concept -- which I'm not passing judgment on one way or the other; I look forward to your own recommendations and to the public comment with respect to it. I know it's a proposal that has engendered a great deal of interest in my community, to put it mildly. But it seems to me that simultaneously, you need to be asking yourself the question of, if this facility is not making money, if it's an underutilized facility, if it is -- really, and it is a quite lovely facility -- what are the range of options available to us, as opposed to looking at one particular proposal and saying, is this suitable or isn't this suitable? So that's what I was striving to see, if that

ROYCE HANSON:

But -- and we -- we do that from time to time. We have solicited proposals for projects. The most recent one was Circle Manor in Kensington, for which we solicited proposals, and we really got none that were regarded as feasible, and in fact, I think we got none. In other cases, we have solicited proposals, and we have received proposals that, on the face, looked pretty good, but when more carefully examined, were proposals for the Parks Department to essentially spend a great deal of money to make something happen. In --but in any case, where the facility -- if we have not yet prepared an RFP and sent it out and we still receive a unsolicited proposal, it seems like the prudent thing to do is to -- is to go ahead and take a look at it. On the other hand, we may have a situation where we have received an unsolicited proposal and we use that as an opportunity to think more broadly and offer the opportunity for others to comment, as well. So the answer to your question is yes and yes.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

All right. Thank you both. And that does conclude the public hearing and the action -- let's see. And we will now move on to Item 6, which is a public hearing on Bill 36-09, Elected Officials - Compensation. This bill would modify the compensation of the County Executive, County Council, Sheriff, and the State's Attorney and generally amend the law relating to compensation of elected officials. Action is tentatively scheduled for December 1, 2009. Persons wishing to submit additional material for the Council's consideration should do so before the close of business on Wednesday, November, 25, 2009. We have one speaker for the public hearing, Mr. Yale Wiesberg, the chair of the Compensation Committee for Elected Officials. And so, Mr. Wiesberg, good afternoon, and we have your written testimony, as well, so please remember to introduce yourself at the beginning of your remarks.

YALE WIESBERG:



Yale Wiesberg. Again, I'm chair of the Compensation Committee to study the 1 compensation of the County Executive, County Council Sheriff, and State's Attorney. 2 President Andrews, members of the Council, the committee has studied the compensation 3 of the County Executive, County Council, Sheriff, and State's Attorney for the next term of 4 office, appreciated the opportunity to present our report to the Council on October 13. We 5 were pleased to see that on November 3, the Council introduced Bill 36-09, which would 6 implement the committee's recommendations. As you know, the committee concluded that 7 in this difficult economic and fiscal environment, increases in the salaries for the County 8 Executive and County Council in the next term of office need to be constrained. With 9 regard to benefits for elected officials, including group insurance and retirement, we 10 believe that these benefits should be consistent with those in place for other County 11 12 employees. This is already the case for group insurance benefits. For retirement benefits, however, we note that 2 recent changes in the Defined Contribution Plan for several 13 thousand County employees, the Retirement Savings Plan, known as the RSP, have not 14 15 been extended to elected officials who participate in a similar plan. Effective July 1, 2008, 16 the County contribution to the employees' RSP accounts went from 6% to 8% of salary, while the contribution for elected officials plan remained at 6%. The employee contribution 17 18 went from 3% to 4%. Effective July 1, 2009, County employees in the RSP were able, at their option, to transfer their account balance to a new plan -- the Guaranteed Retirement 19 Income Plan, known as GRIP, which provides a 7.25% annual return, while participants in 20 the elected officials plan did not have this option. The committee believes that, in the 21 22 interest of consistency, these 2 changes in the retirement plan for County employees should be extended to participants in the elected officials plan, starting in the next term of 23 24 office. We recommend that the Council amend Bill 36-09 to achieve this result. Please let 25 me know if we can provide any further information on this or any other matters affecting 26 the bill.

27 28 29

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you, Mr. Wiesberg, and thank you for your service on the commission, which I know you had done before, as well, and also to the other commissioners who served on it. Appreciate the time that you put into it.

31 32 33

30

YALE WIESBERG:

Thank you.

343536

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

- 37 And there are no other questions or comments, so that concludes the public hearing.
- 38 Agenda Item 7 is a public hearing on Expedited Bill 39-09, Property Tax Credit -
- 39 Renewable Energy Annual Aggregate Limit. This bill would amend the annual aggregate
- 40 limit for the property tax credit for solar and geothermal energy devices and energy
- 41 conservation devices and generally amend the law relating to the renewable energy
- 42 property tax credit. An MFP Committee worksession is tentatively is scheduled for

41



Monday, November 30, 2009, at 2:00. Persons wishing to submit additional material for 1 the Council's consideration should do so before the close of business on Wednesday, 2 3

November 25, 2009. We have one speaker signed up for this hearing and he is Stephen

Shaw, representing Rebuilding Together Montgomery County and the Montgomery 4

County Energy & Air Quality Advisory Committee, it looks like. So, Mr. Shaw, welcome.

6 7 STEPHEN SHAW:

5

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28 29

30 31

32 33

34 35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

My name is Stephen Shaw. Good afternoon. First, I thank the County Council for its historically strong commitment to environmental issues and better use of energy. It has really been wonderful. I'm a County resident involved as a volunteer in promoting energy conservation, especially through home weatherization. In these comments, I speak for myself, but my proposal has been shaped by several County groups. I serve on the County's Energy & Air Quality Advisory Committee, I volunteer with Rebuilding Together, helping low-income homeowners, and I'm involved with Bethesda Green. My comments relate primarily to the energy conservation half of this program. Conservation -- energy conservation -- is the single most effective strategy for green energy, and although renewable energy is important, it is not as nearly as cost effective as conservation. The amendment under consideration reduces the scope of the conservation program, and I believe that's the wrong strategy. Instead, some simple steps could greatly increase the effectiveness of the conservation program. It's a wonderful program, but it's underutilized seriously. It could provide \$250 for each of a thousand homeowners each year, but its utilization has been less than a fifth of that anticipated utilization. So what's wrong, and how can we fix it? Well, first, people don't know about the credit, so let me give you a surprising example. Last week, I talked to the general manager of a local Home Depot. He, of all people, should know about the credit, but surprisingly -- shockingly, even -- he didn't know about the credit. So I propose that a good way to promote awareness is through local building suppliers. They can be a pivotal connection to the do-it-yourself community. If we inform and motivate building supply vendors, they will inform and educate their customers -- for example, as part of weatherization workshops. Second, the process of filing for the credit is flawed. I know because I filed for one this year. The information on the Web is limited. Phone is not answered. Emails are not returned. You don't even get an acknowledgement when you submit a -- your application. So, this is hardly the way to promote energy conservation. In short, we need to disseminate the information and make the process for filing more user-friendly. In addition, 2 changes to the legislation could make a big difference. The biggest impact would be simplification of the process of reimbursement. It should be a mechanism that is simple and quick. For example, how about a voucher program, perhaps handled through local building supply vendors? Finally, I propose that Montgomery County partner with approved nonprofit organizations to obtain and use energy conservation funds on behalf of homeowners. For example, Rebuilding Together volunteers do weatherization as part of their assistance for low-income homeowners. Often, volunteers are available, but money is not available for supplies. So if that group could access the funds for a homeowner and promote



1 weatherization in their home, that would help get the process done. In conclusion, I propose that conservation funds not be reduced from their current limit. Instead, I propose 2 3 that any unutilized funds for conservation in a given year be immediately released for solar and geothermal applications. Thank you. 4

5 6

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you, Mr. Shaw. Councilmember Floreen has a guestion or comment.

7 8 9

11 12

13

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

Mr. Shaw, I wanted to thank you. You identified some discrete problems and offered some 10 discrete solution, and that, I will tell you, in this world, is not all that common. So I just wanted to thank you for this. I see Mr. Edwards sitting in the back there. We're going to make sure that the Department of Environmental Protection is aware of these issues, and we'll try to straighten them out and look at your suggestions. But that was very, very helpful, so thank you.

STEPHEN SHAW:

18 Thank you. I've uncovered some excellence in the County, too. I must say that Eric 19 Coffman at DEP is outstanding, just extraordinary, and Alan Hepler at Housing -- the Low-Income Weatherization Program -- has been outstanding, so I think there are sort of 20 21 wonderful pieces to work with, but the need is -- is enormous. And I think there has been excellent leadership on the County in some of these areas. In particular, I think George 22 Leventhal and Roger Berliner have been extraordinary, and some of their staff. 23

24 25

26

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

They have, indeed. And -- but we thank you for those additional comments. We obviously need to put you on a couple more committees.

31

32 33

STEPHEN SHAW:

There's an interesting movement evolving in Cambridge, Massachusetts, of a group called Home Energy Efficiency Team, and they're volunteers who run barn raisings, as they call them. And they get groups of volunteers working together, weatherizing each other's homes and public buildings. And I went up there for one of them, and it's really an extraordinary effort, so it's -- and they've now -- 15 or 16 in local communities around the Boston area that are evolving. So with encouragement, there -- there is promise.

COUNCILMEMBER FLOREEN:

Thank you. Thank you. 38

39 40

41

42

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you, Mr. Shaw. And that concludes this public hearing. So we're now on to Item 8, which is a public hearing on Expedited Bill 44-09, Buildings - Energy Efficiency - Deferral.



This bill would defer the effective date for requiring that certain residential buildings meet 1 certain ENERGY STAR standards and generally amend the law relating to buildings, 2 energy, and environmental policy. Action is tentatively scheduled for December 1, 2009. 3 Persons wishing to submit additional material for the Council's consideration must do so 4 before the close of business on Wednesday November 25, 2009. And we have 2 5 speakers signed up for this public hearing -- Mr. Stan Edwards, representing the County 6 Executive, and Mr. Randy Melvin, representing the Maryland-National Capital Building 7 Industry Association. If either of you have written testimony, please give it to our clerk, and 8 please remember to introduce yourself at the beginning of your testimony. Mr. Edwards. 9 10 vou're first.

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

STAN EDWARDS:

Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Stan Edwards. I'm the chief of the Division of Environmental Policy and Compliance in the Department of Environmental Protection. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on behalf of the County Executive on Expedited Bill 44-09 to defer implementation of the requirement that certain new homes meet ENERGY STAR guidelines. As you are aware, Bill 30-07 required certain residential buildings, for which a building permit application would be filed on or after January 1. 2010, to meet ENERGY STAR guidelines. That bill also asked DEP to determine if there existed an alternative standard that, one, would achieve the same energy efficiency goals as ENERGY STAR and, two, and was less costly to builders and buyers of covered buildings. After enactment of Bill 30-07, DEP conducted a comprehensive analysis of the following alternative standards: the 2009 International Energy Conservation Code, referred to as IECC-2009; the National Association of Home Builders National Green Building Standard; and the Department of Energy's Builder Challenge. DEP concluded that IECC-2009, with a local modification that would require a blower door test as a method of verifying compliance, would achieve the same energy goals as ENERGY STAR. We also concluded that the cost of complying with this alternative standard would be comparable to the cost of complying with ENERGY STAR. However, based on the available data, we were unable to conclude with certainty that the cost of complying with this alternative standard would be less than the cost of complying with ENERGY STAR, which was the standard in 30-07. The state recently adopted IECC-2009 as the state energy code, effective October 1, 2009, and mandated that all local jurisdictions adopt this code by April 1, 2010. The Department of Permitting Services has drafted proposed regulations that would amend the County's building code to adopt IECC-2009. The proposed regulations will be published in the December 2009 County Register and submitted to the Council in early 2010. In light of the comparability of IECC-2009 and ENERGY STAR guidelines, the County Executive recommends that the Council make the final decision regarding the appropriate energy conservation standard for covered buildings under 30-07 at the same time that it considers the proposed regulations to adopt IECC-2009. This would allow the Council to obtain a full understanding of how IECC-2009 relates to ENERGY STAR before making a final decision regarding the appropriate

44



standard for applicable residential homes. Be happy to answer any questions the Council may have.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you, Mr. Edwards. Our next speaker is Randy Melvin.

RANDY MELVIN:

Good afternoon, President Andrews and Councilmembers. My name is Randy Melvin, and I'm here representing the Maryland-National Capital Building Industry Association. I'm the chairman-elect for the BIA's Codes and Standards committee for next year. Raquel has asked me to step in today. She is currently out on medical leave. We would like to thank the Department of Environmental Protection -- Stan and Eric in particular -- Department of Permitting Services -- George and Hadi-- for meeting with industry members to address how best to increase energy efficiency in new homes and to address our concerns. The industry was concerned that the January 1, 2010, mandate created by Bill 30-07 ignored alternative programs which achieved equal or better energy efficiencies. After much study and analysis, DEP concluded that the 2009 changes to the Energy Conservation Code could achieve the efficiency goals set in Bill 30-09. We support Bill 44-09, as it creates the opportunity for the Council to evaluate the consistency provided by using a code standard to increase energy efficiency. We look forward to participating in the worksessions with the Council as it reviews the 2009 IECC and working with DPS on the regulations for new codes. Thank you.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you, Mr. Melvin. Council Vice President Berliner has a question or comment.

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

Mr. Melvin, I take issue with the notion that we somehow ignored alternatives. I believe our legislation explicitly called for precisely this type of analysis in the event that there were alternatives that indeed were comparable and less costly to your industry. So I am comfortable that, if the analysis of our experts with respect to this, is that it does in fact achieve comparable results, that that's -- that's a good thing. My question for Mr. Edwards is that, it was certainly my intention, with respect to the legislation, that ENERGY STAR, of course, is a living, breathing document, and it gets stronger. What is your thought with respect to what the County would have to do -- let's assume the following hypothetical: that ENERGY STAR gets stronger than the code that you are currently recommending. Your thoughts with respect to the County's posture at that point?

RANDY MELVIN:

Well, we expect that to happen. Our understanding is that ENERGY STAR will be updated in 2011.



COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

Yes.

RANDY MELVIN:

Of course, immediately after that will come the 2012 version of the Energy Conservation Code. So I think we're going to be in the same situation of perhaps adopting a standard or a guideline that will immediately be equaled or surpassed by the energy code. And it's the feeling of DEP, and I know the feeling of the building industry and the Department of Permitting Services, that we're much better off achieving energy efficiency standards through codes as opposed to alternative guidelines. The building industry understands codes. They're used to working with them. They work with them in all other aspects of the building industry, so to have the same thing on energy would be useful. So I think -- I think we're going to have to revisit the issue and see what happens to ENERGY STAR, as well as what happens to the 2012 version of the code.

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

The codes have been a little slower in the past. My hope is that the building industry comes on board, and in the past, it has been somewhat resistant to strong energy codes. So my hope is that we don't have this disconnect that forces us to make a choice.

RANDY MELVIN:

I think it's a "stay tuned" sort of story, and we'll have to come back and talk about it.

COUNCIL VICE PRESIDENT BERLINER:

Thank you, sir.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

Thank you, Council Vice President Berliner, and thank you both. That concludes this public hearing, and we have one more public hearing this afternoon, after which we have action on that public hearing. And the next public hearing is on a resolution to approve a County Guaranteed Bond Financing Plan for the Housing Opportunities Commission for the Wheaton MetroPointe Apartments development. Action is scheduled immediately following this hearing. There are no speakers for this hearing. There is a Management and Fiscal Policy Committee recommendation on the matter, and I'll turn to the chair of that committee, Councilmember Trachtenberg, for the committee's recommendation.

COUNCILMEMBER TRACHTENBERG:

- 39 Thank you, Councilmember Andrews. This is -- was discussed briefly within the MFP
- 40 Committee yesterday. Obviously, we are familiar with the project, which is a very
- 41 successful HOC endeavor, and we considered the item before us as a housekeeping
- 42 item. Basically, there was a request that was received from the Council President asking

November 24, 2009



approval for continued use of the County's guarantee for the issuance of \$33 million in tax-exempt bonds for 2 years. There are assorted memos attached in the packet provided to all of us today. I'd be happy to go over the specifics if it's requested by a colleague. And again, the recommendation from the MFP Committee was a unanimous recommendation to support the request as provided.

6 7

8

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANDREWS:

- OK. Thank you, Chair Trachtenberg, for the committee's report. And I don't see any
- 9 comments or questions, so I think we're ready to vote on it. All those in favor of the
- 10 resolution to approve County Guaranteed Bond Financing Plan for the Housing
- 11 Opportunities Commission MetroPointe Apartments development, please raise your hand.
- 12 That is unanimous, 9-0. All right. We are finished for the afternoon, and thank you all, and
- happy Thanksgiving. We'll see you Monday and Tuesday next week.

14